

FILED - USDC -NH
2024 JUN 24 AM 10:10

9117

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Josephine Amatucci

v.

Estes, Champaigne, Morgan, TOWN OF WOLFEBORO

Dean Rondeau, Wright and Robert Maloney

A NEW CAUSE OF ACTION MANDATED
UNDER THE CONSTITUTION
AS ATTACHED

IN RESPONSE TO 6/12/2024 ENDORSED ORDER OF COURT

1. The Court is MANDATED to document this new casue of action, as a Complaint in a new cause of acion which arises out of the violations of the Plaintiff's UNITED STATES FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, where NO LOCAL "RESTRICTIONS" no local procedures, of the Court, can/will impose on the RIGHTS of the Plaintiff as allowed under the her rights under the Federal Constitution. As defined under Article Six of the United States Constitution, the LAW OF THE LAND,
2. Also as verified by the Supreme Court in the case of Miranda v. Arizona, where the Court ruled:

"That the "CONSTITUTION" answers the question that "Our government cannot LEGALLY put "RESTRICTIONS" on the rights of the American people AT ANY TIME,

FOR ANY REASON, as found in Article Six of the United States Constitution, which states, "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved , there can be NO RULE MAKING or Legislation WHICH WOULD ABROGATE THEM."

3. And in the cases of Sherer v. Cullen, Hanson v. Denckla, etc. etc. etc. where the rulings of the judges are contrary to Mr. Laplante's FRAUDULENT MISREPRESENTATION OF THE LAW, when Laplante bases his denial to allow the Plaintiff's new cause of action to be docketed under LOCAL RESTRICTIONS. Which is a violation of his OATH OF OFFICE where he is mandated and BOUND BY THE SUPREME LAW TO ACCEPT THIS NEW CAUSE OF ACTION, as allowed under the Federal Constitution. Under the LAW OF THE LAND. Which overrides any local procedure, or BIAS decision of the Court where the CONSTITUTIONAL law states:

"Under Article Six of the UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, "no rights secured by the Constitution, where rights secured by the CONSTITUTION are involved , there can be NO RULE (NO RESTRICTIONS) making or Legislation which would ABROGATE THEM."

4. That therefore Laplante's filing restrictions are void and have NO LEGAL FORCE, his restrictions do not OVERRIDE the laws of the UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, under the Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendment, which allow the Plaintiff her lawsuit for damages, under 1983, under Monell.

WHEREFORE: Either this court docket this new cause of action as MANDATED UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, or Judge Laplante is MANDATED to step down from this case as he has TRESPASSED AGAINST THE LAW OF THE LAND, he has trespassed against his OATH OF OFFICE, by unlawfully denying the Plaintiff her new cause of action, where any and all of his rulings are thus VOID OF NO LEGAL FORCE. And another judge will take over the case. Or, the Plaintiff will be obligated to file a lawsuit against Laplante, individually, for denying the Plaintiff her Federal Constitutional rights to damages for the unlawful and MALICIOUS PROSECUTION filed against her, by the defendants. As the Court cannot, willNOT/CANNOT ...deny leave to document this legal new cause of action, which is attached.

Respectfully,

Josephine Amatucci



June 20, 2024

Fox
Wolf



MAIL

PLACE STICKER AT TOP OF ENVELOPE TO THE RIGHT
OF THE RETURN ADDRESS. FOLD AT DOTTED LINE



7022 3330 0001 2491 8687

FIRST CLASS

United States District Court
District of New Hampshire
Office of the Clerk
55 Federal St.
Room 110
Concord, N.H. 03301

blc
6/22



Retail



RDC 99



03301

U.S. POSTAGE PAID
FCM LG ENV
WOLFEBORO FALLS
NH 03896
JUN 21, 2024
\$3.55
S2324K500781-01